

BORIS FELDMAN, State Bar No. 128838 (boris.feldman@wsgr.com)
DOUGLAS J. CLARK, State Bar No. 171499 (dclark@wsgr.com)
CHERYL W. FOUNG, State Bar No. 108868 (cfoung@wsgr.com)
KELLEY E. MOOHR, State Bar No. 216823 (kmoohr@wsgr.com)
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
Professional Corporation
650 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1050
Telephone: (650) 493-9300
Facsimile: (650) 565-5100

Attorneys for Defendants
PIXAR, STEVEN P. JOBS,
EDWIN E. CATMULL and SIMON T. BAX

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

IN RE PIXAR SECURITIES LITIGATION

Case No. CV-05-4290-JSW

CLASS ACTION

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:

**STIPULATION AND ~~[PROPOSED]~~
ORDER TO EXTEND PAGE
LIMITS RE BRIEFING ON
MOTION TO DISMISS**

ALL ACTIONS

1 WHEREAS, on May 26, 2006, plaintiff filed an Amended Complaint for Violations of
2 Federal Securities Laws (the "Amended Complaint") in the above-entitled matter;

3 WHEREAS, pursuant to the Court's March 23, 2006 and May 17, 2006 orders, and
4 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 5(b)(2)(D) and 6(a) and (e), defendants' Pixar, Steven P. Jobs,
5 Edwin E. Catmull and Simon T. Bax (collectively, "Defendants") motion to dismiss is currently
6 due June 29, 2006, plaintiff's opposition to the motion to dismiss is currently due August 3,
7 2006, and Defendants' reply in support of Defendants' motion to dismiss is currently due August
8 28, 2006;

9 WHEREAS, given the anticipated complex nature of the motion to dismiss the Amended
10 Complaint under the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act, it is appropriate to follow Local
11 Rules 7-2(b), 7-3(a), 7-3(c), and 7-4(b) concerning page limitations, rather than this Court's
12 Standing Order which limits opening, opposition, and reply briefs to 15 pages;

13 WHEREAS, the parties hereby seek an extension to the page limits applicable under this
14 Court's standing order; and

15 WHEREAS, pursuant to the Local Rules, Defendants' memorandum in support of their
16 motion to dismiss would not exceed 25 pages, plaintiff's opposition to the motion to dismiss
17 would not exceed 25 pages, and Defendants' reply memorandum would not exceed 15 pages.

18 THEREFORE, for the reasons described above, Defendants respectfully request that the
19 Court allow the parties the additional pages provided under Local Rules 7-2(b), 7-3(a), 7-3(c),
20 and 7-4(b).

21 Dated: June 2, 2006

WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI, P.C.

22 By: /s/ Kelley E. Moohr
23 Kelley E. Moohr

24 Attorneys for Defendants
25
26
27
28

1 Dated: June 2, 2006

MILBERG WEISS BERSHAD & SCHULMAN LLP

2 By: /s/Karen T. Rogers

3 Karen T. Rogers

4 Lead Counsel for Plaintiffs

5
6
7 **~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER**

8 Defendants' motion to dismiss due June 29, 2006, shall not exceed 25 pages, plaintiff's
9 opposition to the motion to dismiss due August 3, 2006, shall not exceed 25 pages, and
10 Defendants' reply in support of Defendants' motion to dismiss, due August 28, 2006, shall not
11 exceed 15 pages.

12
13 Dated: June 2, 2006

By: 

14 THE HONORABLE JEFFREY S. WHITE
15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28